DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 944 IR 050 825

AUTHOR English, Thomas G.
TITLE Administrators' Views of Librarian Personnel Status: The Complete, Original Report.
PUB DATE May 84
NOTE 27p.; When this report appeared as a journal article, 11 of the original 14 tables, 5 of 8 references, and all 3 appendices were omitted.
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
JOURNAL CIT College & Research Libraries; v45 n3 p189-95 May 1984

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Academic Rank (Professional); *Administrator Attitudes; Fringe Benefits; Higher Education; *Librarians; Opinions; Questionnaires; Research Methodology; Surveys; Tables (Data); Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Status; Halo Effect

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires were sent to the office of academic affairs or its equivalent in each of the 89 U.S. academic members of the Association of Research Libraries to elicit the opinions of non-library university administrators on the issue of faculty status for academic librarians. Data gathered from 32 state institutions and 15 private institutions (53%) are reported in tables and text for the following: (1) comparison of faculty and non-faculty librarians' benefits and privileges; (2) actual and perceived advantages to the institution of granting librarians faculty status; (3) perceived disadvantages of faculty status; (4) appropriate classifications of librarians; (5) difficulties with tenure requirements; and (6) librarian satisfaction. Based on an analysis of the data collected, it was concluded that academic institutions may lack a clear rationale for granting librarians faculty status. This conclusion was based primarily on the fact that the opinions expressed by administrators tended to confirm the validity of two key suppositions: there are no substantive advantages to an institution of granting librarians faculty status, and the terms and conditions of faculty appointments are largely unsuited to the day-to-day activities and responsibilities of librarians. Direct quotations from administrator's statements are included, and a discussion of the halo effect produced by granting faculty status to librarians is appended. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ADMINISTRATORS' VIEWS OF LIBRARIAN PERSONNEL STATUS: THE COMPLETE, ORIGINAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED247944

by

Thomas G. English
Assistant Professor and Head
Bell Museum of Natural History Library
University of Minnesota

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas G. English
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Introduction and Methodology

Is it to the advantage of an academic institution to place its librarians in the same personnel category as its regular teaching faculty? Is it to the advantage of librarians to have faculty status, as opposed to a professional or administrative classification? Are the traditional, primary, faculty requirements for tenure - demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and research - appropriate to the regular duties and responsibilities of librarians? Answers to these questions were sought by the author through an analysis of opinions collected from university administrators of forty-seven academic member-institutions of the Association of Research Libraries (Table 1).

The author first conducted an extensive search of the literature in an effort to determine if the views of college and university administrators on the subject of librarian status had been published. Finding only one relevant article,* the author elected to carry out a survey designed specifically to solicit such views. Accordingly, a questionnaire was sent to the office of academic affairs, or the equivalent administrative office, in each of the eight-nine U.S. academic member-institutions of the Association of Research Libraries. Eventually, completed questionnaires were returned

---

When this report appeared as an article in College & Research Libraries, May, 1984,[1] eleven of the original fourteen tables, five of eight references and all three appendices were deleted as an editorial expediency.

*The author is indebted to Victor D. Meskill and L. Drew Meskill, whose 1975 review article was the principal inspiration for this study.[2]

IR050825

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Table 1. List of Participating Institutions

State Institutions (32)				Private Institutions (15)	
1.	Arizona	17.	Michigan	1.	Boston
2.	California-Davis	18.	Michigan State	2.	Case Western
3.	Cincinnati	19.	Nebraska	3.	Columbia
4.	Colorado	20.	Ohio State	4.	Cornell
5.	Colorado State	21.	Oklahoma	5.	Dartmouth
6.	Connecticut	22.	Oregon	6.	Duke
7.	Florida	23.	Purdue	7.	Georgetown
8.	Florida State	24.	South Carolina	8.	Miami
9.	Georgia	25.	SUNY-Albany	9.	Northwestern
10.	Illinois	26.	Tennessee	10.	Princeton
11.	Indiana	27.	Texas A & M	11.	Southern California
12.	Iowa	28.	Utah	12.	Stanford
13.	Iowa State	29.	Virginia	13.	Syracuse
14.	Kansas	30.	Virginia Polytechnic	14.	Tulane
15.	Louisiana State	31.	Washington (Seattle)	15.	Yale
16.	Maryland	32.	Wisconsin		

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Table 2.

Participating Institutions Listed According to the Personnel Status of their Librarians

Institutions reporting faculty status for Librarians (21)	Institutions reporting nonfaculty status for Librarians (26)
1. Arizona	1. Boston
2. Colorado	2. California-Davis
3. Colorado State	3. Case Western
4. Florida	4. Cincinnati
5. Illinois	5. Columbia
6. Iowa State	6. Connecticut
7. Kansas	7. Cornell
8. Louisiana State	8. Dartmouth
9. Miami	9. Duke
10. Nebraska	10. Florida State
11. Ohio State	11. Georgetown
12. Oklahoma	12. Georgia
13. Oregon	13. Indiana
14. Purdue	14. Iowa
15. South Carolina	15. Maryland
16. Southern California	16. Michigan
17. SUNY-Albany	17. Michigan State
18. Tennessee	18. Northwestern
19. Texas A & M	19. Princeton
20. Virginia	20. Stanford
21. Virginia Polytechnic	21. Syracuse
	22. Tulane
	23. Utah
	24. Washington (Seattle)
	25. Wisconsin
	26. Yale

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

by administrators (nonlibrarians) of forty-seven different institutions, 52.8 percent of the target group. Thirty-two of the respondents were from state institutions, and fifteen were from private institutions (Table 1). Librarians were reported to have faculty status in twenty-one of the institutions, and professional (nonfaculty) status in twenty-six (Table 2). While the names of individual participants in the study have not been divulged in the report, respondents have been identified by titles (Table 3).

The original survey, which consisted of ten questions, was augmented by several short, follow-up surveys. Five of the original questions were directed at, and answered by, all forty-seven respondents. The other five questions were directed only at those institutions whose librarians had faculty status, so that, appropriately, only twenty-one respondents answered the latter queries. The purpose of the follow-up surveys was to obtain brief written statements from respondents in support of their answers to key questions. Thus, more than thirty supplementary statements were added to the initial questionnaire data. These statements, in the opinion of the author, greatly enriched the content of the final report.

Advantages to Librarians

The first question of the survey (Table 4) sought to determine if administrators were of the opinion that faculty status is an advantage to librarians. Overall, thirty-one of forty-seven respondents (66.0 percent) felt that faculty status was of 'some' or 'considerable advantage' to librarians. As might be expected, in those institutions whose librarians had faculty status, an even larger majority (85.7 percent) were of the same opinion. In those institutions whose librarians had nonfaculty status,

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Table 3

Identity of Respondents by Title

(By number in each category)

Vice Chancellor	3	Vice President	15
Associate Vice Chancellor	1	Associate Vice President	3
Assistant Vice Chancellor	1	Assistant Vice President	1
Assistant to the Vice Chancellor	1	Assistant to the Vice President	1
Subtotal	6	Subtotal	20
Dean of Faculties	1	Provost	2
Associate Dean of Faculties	1	Vice Provost	2
Assistant Dean of Faculties	1	Deputy Provost	2
		Associate Provost	5
Subtotal	3	Assistant Provost	3
		Assistant to the Provost	2
		Subtotal	16
Assistant Chief Executive Officer	1		
Special Assistant to the President	1		
Subtotal	2	GRAND TOTAL: 47 Respondents	

Table 4

In your opinion, is it to the advantage of librarians to have faculty status?

(By number of respondents)

Respondents from institutions with nonfaculty Librarians (26)			Respondents from institutions with faculty Librarians (21)	
(03.8%)	1	Considerable Advantage	14	(66.7%)
(46.2%)	12	Some Advantage	4	(19.0%)
(50.0%)	13	No Advantage	3	(14.3%)
(100%)	26	Totals	21	(100%)

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

respondents were evenly divided in their views. Thirteen of these twenty-six respondents (50.0 percent) felt that librarians were advantaged by faculty status, while the other thirteen (50.0 percent) felt that faculty status provided 'no advantage' to librarians.

Comparison of Librarian Benefits and Privileges

In Table 5, the benefits and privileges of faculty librarians were compared with those of nonfaculty librarians in the institutions surveyed. The results indicated that faculty status does tend to provide more advantages to librarians than does nonfaculty status.* For example, it was found that faculty librarians were much more likely to be accorded traditional faculty rank and tenure, which, in the academic community, are generally perceived to enhance both prestige and job security. Also, it was found that librarians with faculty status were more likely to receive other major benefits and privileges such as research leave, sabbatical leave, research funds, and appointment options. While librarians with nonfaculty status were equally benefitted in the provision of pensions and travel funds, they were favored in only one category, that of tuition assistance. Thus, the evidence clearly supported the view that faculty status does provide substantive advantages to librarians. At the same time, faculty status may impose terms and conditions of appointment on the probationary appointee which are neither advantageous nor desirable. This seeming paradox, whose roots lie in the difficulties encountered

---

*These findings were consistent with the results of the much larger survey published earlier by the author.[3]

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Table 5

Benefits and Privileges of Faculty Librarians versus Nonfaculty Librarians
(By number of institutions)

Institutions with faculty Librarians (21)			Institutions with nonfaculty Librarians (26)
(66.7%)	14	Faculty Rank	0 (00.0%)
(90.5%)	19	Indefinite Tenure	1* (03.8%)
(100%)	21	Pension	26 (100%)
(90.5%)	19	Research Funds	14 (53.8%)
(100%)	21	Travel Funds	26 (100%)
(81.0%)	17	Research Leave	19 (73.1%)
(85.7%)	18	Sabbatical Leave	4 (15.4%)
(61.9%)	13	Tuition Break	19 (73.1%)
(28.6%)	6	Option of Nine-Month Appointment	6 (23.1%)

* Indiana's librarians were reported to be placed in a special academic personnel category (nonfaculty), parallel to the teaching faculty, and with the provision of indefinite tenure.[4]

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

in the interpretation of faculty tenure requirements for librarians, is discussed later in the report.

Advantages to the Institution

As for advantages to the institution of granting librarians faculty status, the majority of administrators held a more negative view. In Table 6, only three of forty-seven respondents (06.4 percent), all from state institutions with faculty librarians, were of the opinion that faculty status for librarians was of 'considerable advantage' to the institution. Sixteen respondents (34.0 percent) indicated 'some advantage', while twenty-eight respondents (59.6 percent) felt that faculty status for librarians was of 'no advantage' to the institution. Several respondents who indicated 'some advantage' to the institution also added marginal notes such as "little" or "very few". And one respondent noted that "while there are some advantages to the institution, there are more disadvantages." Even more revealing, perhaps, was the fact that eight administrators - representing institutions with faculty librarians - were found to hold the view that granting librarians faculty status was of 'no advantage' to the institution.

Substantive advantages to the institution - measureable benefits or gains that could only be achieved by librarians with faculty status - were not readily discernible, either in the literature of librarianship, or in the data collected in the survey. Any advantages that may have once been gained by an institution in recruitment (e.g. the 1960's) would appear to be largely nullified in the diminished job market of the 1980's. But in the past, at least, some institutions evidently believed that the ability to offer

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Table 6

In your view, is it to the advantage of the institution to grant librarians faculty status?
(by number of respondents)

Respondents from institutions with nonfaculty Librarians (26)			Respondents from institutions with faculty Librarians (21)	
(00.0%)	0	Considerable Advantage	3	(14.3%)
(23.1%)	6	Some Advantage	10	(47.6%)
(76.9%)	20	No Advantage	8	(38.1%)
(100%)	26	Totals	21	(100%)

Table 7

Do you feel that "competition in recruitment" was an important factor in the institution's original decision to grant librarians faculty status?*
(By number of respondents)

Considerable importance	3	(14.3%)
Some importance	11	(52.4%)
No importance	7	(33.3%)
Totals	21	(100%)

* This question applied only to the twenty-one institutions with faculty librarians.

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

librarians faculty appointments tended to give them an edge in the recruitment of once-scarce personnel. In the data summarized in Table 7, fourteen of twenty-one respondents (66.7 percent) felt that competition in recruitment was of 'some' or 'considerable importance' in the institution's original decision to grant librarians faculty status.

Perceived Advantages

In Appendix A, statements provided by administrators have been arranged side-by-side in two columns. Column A contains statements of perceived advantages to the institution, while Column B contains statements of perceived disadvantages to the institution of granting librarians faculty status. In listing their perceived advantages to the institution, administrators focused on chiefly psychological factors, with a good deal of conjecture about the probable (desirable) influence of faculty status on librarian conduct and performance. The result was a rather idealized portrait of the librarian as faculty member.* An analysis of the statement in Column A revealed the following: (1) faculty status was alleged to attract "a better qualified, more academically oriented professional to library service"; (2) faculty status was believed to improve the morale and self-esteem of librarians, giving them "a closer feeling of belonging to the institution, rather than second-class citizenship"; (3) faculty status was purported to prompt the acceptance of librarians "as professional peers by faculty members in the other disciplines"; (4) faculty status was thought to motivate librarians to "act

---

*For a discussion of the expression "halo-effect", see Appendix C.

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

responsibly", exhibit a "professional attitude toward the position", and to "develop research programs"; and (5) faculty status was believed to open the way for librarians "to participate on university committees", to "participate in all faculty curricular deliberations, and thus understand the course and direction of university academic policy."

If it is true, as suggested in some of the aforementioned statements, that it is to the institution's advantage to encourage librarians to develop research projects, to serve on faculty committees, and to participate in curricular deliberations, etc., it does not necessarily follow that these goals can only be achieved by granting librarians faculty status. On the contrary, in some of the institutions surveyed, it was found that the lack of faculty status did not deter librarians from participating fully in the academic enterprise:

> "Librarians at Indiana University have many of the same rights and privileges as faculty...They can achieve tenured status ...They have sabbatical leave opportunities; they participate in the same fringe-benefit system as faculty; and they are represented on the Faculty Council and participate fully on many faculty committees..."
>
> Associate Dean of the Faculties

> "Librarians at Michigan University are provided opportunity for librarian/instructional staff interaction and consultation through membership in the University Senate, election to the Senate Assembly, and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs, and all committees established by this governance structure. Librarians are also encouraged to develop research projects and to contribute to other original scholarship."
>
> Vice President for Academic Affairs

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

"Librarians at the University of Utah are placed in an "academic librarian" classification (nonfaculty). However, they are eligible to serve on the University Senate (two positions are reserved for the libraries), and on university standing committees, either by election or by appointment. Currently, a librarian is serving on the Senate Executive Committee. Also, librarians in this institution are eligible for academic leave with pay, so that they may have additional opportunities to carry out original research."

Associate Vice President for
Academic Affairs

Perceived Disadvantages of Faculty Status

Turning to the statements of perceived disadvantages to the institution of granting librarians faculty status (Column B, Appendix A), respondents were nearly unanimous in singling out as the key problem the unsuitability for librarians of the traditional, primary, faculty requirements for tenure - demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and research. These traditional tenure requirements were thought by administrators to be inappropriate for librarians because: (1) librarians have "different basic responsibilities" from the regular teaching faculty; (2) their "work and traditions are different"; and (3) "the degree of freedom and independence afforded librarians is much less than for the faculty." As a consequence:

"...librarians have difficulty in meeting common standards of teaching and scholarship."

Vice President for Academic Affairs

"Only a very few of the academic librarians can meet faculty requirements for tenure."

Associate Vice President for
Academic Affairs

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

"It is inappropriate to place librarians under the same evaluation criteria. They are not faculty."

Assistant Provost

"Promotion and tenure decisions are difficult because the criteria for librarians are different than for faculty generally."

Provost

Appropriate Classification of Librarians

The next two items of the survey sought administrator opinions regarding the most appropriate classification for academic librarians. In Table 8, it is seen that only eleven of forty-seven respondents (23.4 percent) were of the opinion that librarians were appropriately classed as faculty, while thirty-six respondents (76.6 percent) were of the opinion that academic librarians were more appropriately classed as nonfaculty. All twenty-six of the administrators from institutions with nonfaculty librarians (100 percent) felt that librarians were more appropriately placed in a nonfaculty category. In contrast, administrators from institutions whose librarians were faculty were in considerable disagreement on this question. Ten of these twenty-one respondents (47.6 percent) were found to hold the view that librarians in their institutions - who had faculty status - would be more appropriately classed nonfaculty.

The findings represented in Table 9 were found to virtually mirror the findings tabulated in Table 8. Again, 100 percent of the respondents from institutions with nonfaculty librarians felt that librarians in their institutions were properly classed; while nearly one-half the respondents (47.6 percent) from institutions with faculty librarians, expressed the view that librarians in their own institutions were inappropriately classed as faculty.

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Table 8

In your view, what is the most appropriate classification for academic librarians?
(by number of respondents)

Respondents from institutions with nonfaculty Librarians (26)			Respondents from institutions with faculty Librarians (21)	
(00.0%)	0	faculty	11	(52.4%)
(100%)	26	nonfaculty	10	(47.6%)
(100%)	26	Totals	21	(100%)

Table 9

Do you feel that librarians in your institution are now properly classed?
(By number of respondents)

Respondents from institutions with nonfaculty Librarians (26)			Respondents from institutions with faculty Librarians (21)	
(100%)	26	Yes	11	(52.4%)
(00.0%)	0	No	10	(47.6%)
(100%)	26	Totals	21	(100%)

Table 10

Do you feel that librarians in your institution are generally satisfied with their present personnel status? (By number of respondents)

Respondents from institutions with nonfaculty Librarians (26)			Respondents from institutions with faculty Librarians (21)	
(11.5%)	3	Very Satisfied	9	(42.8%)
(84.6%)	22	Satisfied	11	(52.4%)
(03.9%)	1	Dissatisfied	1	(04.8%)
(100%)	26	Totals	21	(100%)

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Librarian Satisfaction

The data contained in Table 10 revealed that the great majority of administrators were of the opinion that librarians in their institutions were satisfied with their personnel status. Only two of forty-seven respondents (04.3 percent) indicated that librarians in their institutions were dissatisfied with their present personnel status. At one university according to the respondent from that institution, librarians were dissatisfied because "a significant number of librarians, at least, want full faculty status, but without scholarship or publishing requirements." At another university whose librarians were reported to have nonfaculty status, both librarians and administrators were said to be dissatisfied because librarians were situated in a hybrid of faculty and professional status which required case-by-case interpretation for each new question that arose.

Difficulties with Tenure Requirements

The final four questions of the survey were directed only at those institutions whose librarians were reported to have faculty status, so that, appropriately, only twenty-one respondents went on to complete these items. The questions were designed to prompt administrators to compare librarian duties and responsibilities with those of the regular teaching and research faculty, and to consider if the terms and conditions of faculty appointments were appropriate for librarians. In Table 11, none of the twenty-one respondents (00.0 percent) felt that there was a 'strong similarity' between librarian and faculty activities and responsibilities. Nine respondents (42.9 percent) felt that there was 'some similarity', while twelve respondents (57.1 percent) were of the opinion that there was 'little similarity' between

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Table 11

Do you feel that librarian day-to-day activities and responsibilities are similar to those of the teaching faculty?

(By number of respondents)

Strong similarity	0	(00.0%)
Some similarity	9	(42.9%)
Little similarity	12	(57.1%)
Total	21	(100%)

Table 12

In your opinion, has the institution ever been required to relax or to amend the traditional, primary, faculty tenure requirements (effectiveness in teaching and research) in order to grant tenure to librarians? (By number of respondents)

Yes	19	(90.5%)
No	2	(09.5%)
Total	21	(100%)

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

faculty and librarian activities and responsibilities.

In Table 12, administrators were asked if, in their opinion, the institution had ever been required to relax or amend the traditional, primary, faculty requirements for tenure in order to grant tenure to librarians. Two respondents (09.5 percent) indicated 'no' to this question, but nineteen of twenty-one respondents (90.5 percent) indicated 'yes' that the traditional tenure requirements - demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and research - had been relaxed or amended in order to grant tenure to librarians. As a follow-up to this question, those respondents who had indicated "yes" were asked to provide a brief statement explaining why the faculty criteria were altered or given a different emphasis for librarians. Thirteen administrators furnished the statements which are displayed in Appendix B.

An analysis of the statements revealed a rather striking administrator ambivalence toward librarians as faculty members. All thirteen respondents had earlier acknowledged that librarians in their institutions had been accorded faculty status. But the tenor of their statements strongly suggested that probably none of them actually perceived librarians to be faculty - at least not in the traditional sense of the word. Rather, librarians tended to be characterized in the statements as a unique professional group, separate and distinct from the regular teaching and research faculty. To begin with, librarians were seen to play a negligible role as classroom teachers, as the following extracts from the statements in Appendix B attest:

> "Librarians at our institution do not teach..."
>
> "...teaching effectiveness (of librarians) has not been considered..."
>
> "No teaching required of librarians..."
>
> "...librarians do little or no formal teaching...

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Moreover, the respondents appeared to expect little from librarians in the way of scholarship and research, as evidenced by the following excerpts:

> "Librarians have never been required to demonstrate scholarship or research..."
>
> "Less rigorous requirement for original scholarship and publication."
>
> "...nor do they (librarians) conduct research as it is conventionally viewed..."
>
> "Librarians...simply are not trained well enough to even approach the level of research we expect and get from the basic disciplines...

The role that these administrators did perceive for librarians tended to emphasize traditional librarianship, with its attendant concern for professional competence and service:

> "Librarians are judged on criteria of service to library users, community service, technical knowledge and competence..."
>
> "Less emphasis on teaching and research, more upon professional expertise, service, and improvement of library resources."
>
> "More emphasis upon university service and professional activity..."

The next item in the survey asked respondents to compare untenured librarians with untenured members of the teaching faculty, in regard to their relative capability to meet the traditional faculty requirements for tenure (Table 13). Fourteen of twenty-one respondents (66.6 percent) were of the opinion that if the faculty performance criteria were applied evenly and stringently for all untenured faculty, untenured librarians would find it 'considerably more difficult' to meet the traditional criteria than would untenured teaching faculty. (Several respondents added the word "impossible".) Three respondents (14.3 percent) indicated that librarians would find it 'somewhat more difficult', while four respondents (19.0 percent) felt that librarians would find it 'no more difficult' to meet the traditional criteria.

Thomas D. English
University of Minnesota

Table 13

If the institution were to apply the traditional criteria evenly and stringently for all its untenured faculty, in your view, would the untenured librarians find it more difficult to meet the criteria than would the untenured teaching faculty?

Considerably more difficult than teaching faculty.....	14	(66.7%)
Somewhat more difficult.....	3	(14.3%)
No more difficult.....	4	(19.0%)
Total	21	(100%)

Table 14

To your knowledge, have any librarians (who were otherwise performing their jobs satisfactorily) been terminated because they did not meet the traditional faculty criteria for tenure? (By number of respondents)

Yes.....	5	(23.8%)
No.....	16	(76.2%)
Total:	21	(100%)

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Terminations

In his earlier study,[3] the author found that faculty librarians, up for tenure or promotion, were characteristically required to meet two distinct sets of performance criteria: one set designed to measure competence in librarianship; the other set designed to measure effectiveness in teaching and research. Moreover, the earlier study uncovered a case in which "a superb reference librarian" had been terminated for failing to meet faculty teaching and publishing requirements.[5] Prompted by his knowledge of that incident, the author sought to document other cases in which faculty librarians, who were judged to be performing effectively as librarians, had been terminated for failing to meet the traditional faculty requirements for tenure. The results (Table 14) revealed that, indeed, such terminations had occurred in five of the twenty-one reporting institutions (23.8 percent). Details of these terminations were not revealed in the data returned, so that the weight given the faculty criteria relative to the weight given the professional criteria in these situations could not be determined. Whatever the case, the incidence of such dismissals does draw attention to the double bind difficulties confronting librarians who are required to meet two sets of performace criteria - particularly when the primary faculty criteria are rigorously applied.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Administrators tended to perceive academic librarians - including those with faculty appointments - to be a distinct, professional (nonfaculty) group, with duties and responsibilities different from those of the regular teaching and research faculty. Evidently, the term faculty status was not considered by administrators to be synonymous with the word faculty.

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Only eleven of forty-seven respondents (23.4 percent) felt that librarians were appropriately classed as faculty, while the great majority (76.6 percent) were of the opinion that academic librarians were more appropriately placed in a professional (nonfaculty) personnel category.

Sixty-six percent of the respondents were of the opinion that librarians were advantaged by the provision of faculty status. At the same time, however, nearly sixty percent (59.6 percent) were of the opinion that granting librarians faculty status was of no advantage to the institution. Difficulty with the interpretation of faculty tenure requirements for librarians was most often cited by administrators as the principal disadvantage - both to the institution and to librarians - of granting librarians faculty status.

In attempting to list perceived advantages to the institution of granting librarians faculty status, administrators appeared to focus chiefly on psychological factors, with a tendency to indulge in conjecture about the supposed uplifting effects of faculty status on librarian attitudes, conduct, and performance. (See Appendix C: Halo-Effect). But none of the stated advantages to the institution were felt by the author to be substantive. At one time, the ability to offer librarians faculty status was apparently thought to give the institution an advantage in the recruitment of once-scarce library personnel, e.g. during the nineteen-sixties. But such an advantage would seem to be largely nullified in the diminished job market of the nineteen-eighties.

Over ninety percent (90.5 percent) of the respondents from institutions with faculty librarians answered 'yes' that the institution had been required to relax or amend the traditional, primary, faculty requirements for tenure - demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and research - in order to grant tenure to librarians. Moreover, eight-one percent of this group of respondents felt

that if institutions were to apply tenure requirements evenly and stringently for all their probationary faculty, untenured librarians would find it more difficult to meet the requirements than would untenured members of the teaching faculty. And, finally, more than twenty percent of these respondents (23.8 percent) reported that there had been cases in their institutions in which librarians - who were otherwise performing their jobs satisfactorily - had been terminated because they did not meet faculty tenure requirements.

CONCLUSIONS

An analysis of the opinions of forty-seven university administrators (nonlibrarians) indicated that academic institutions may lack a rational basis for granting librarians faculty status. To begin with, an interpretation of the opinions provided led the author to conclude that, presently at least, there are no substantive advantages to an institution of placing its librarians in the same personnel category as its regular teaching faculty. Indeed, the survey results tended to support the view that librarians with professional (nonfaculty) status - given equal opportunity and encouragement - can probably serve the needs of the institution just as effectively as librarians with faculty status, with few, if any, of the inherent drawbacks. Moreover, taken in toto, the opinions expressed by administrators suggested that the terms and conditions of faculty appointments are largely inappropriate to the principal activities and responsibilities of librarians: librarians were seen by administrators to play a negligible role as classroom teachers; and administrators seemed to expect little of librarians in the way of scholarship and research contributions. The role that administrators did seem to consider most appropriate for librarians tended to emphasize the duties and functions of traditional librarianship. Thus, professional competence, technical expertise, and service were seen by administrators as the principal concerns of academic librarians.

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

REFERENCES

1. Thomas G. English. "Administrators' Views of Library Personnel Status," College and Research Libraries 45: 189-195 (May 1984).

2. Victor D. Meskill and L. Drew Meskill. "Let's consider the faculty status of librarians," Educational Horizons 53:178-180 (Summer 1975).

3. Thomas G. English. "Librarian status in the eighty-nine U.S. academic institutions of the Association of Research Libraries: 1982," College and Research Libraries 44:199-211 (May 1983).

4. Stephen Wailes, Associate Dean of Faculties, Indiana University, letter to author, 9 May 1980.

5. Thomas W. Shaughnessy, formerly Assistant Director of Libraries for Public Services, University of Houston, telephone interview with author, 14 December 1981.

6. Robert H. Muller, "Institutional dynamics of faculty status for librarians" in Lewis C. Branscomb, ed., The case for faculty status for academic librarians, ACRL monograph no. 33:30-41 (Chicago: American Library Assn., 1970.

7. Edward L. Thorndike, "A constant error in psychological ratings". Journal of Applied Psychology 4:25-29 (1920).

8. See for instance, American educators' encyclopedia, ed. by Edward L. Dynoska and David E. Kopel, p. 241 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982) and Keywords in education, ed. by K.T. Collins, et al, p. 99 (New York, Longman, 1973).

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

Appendix A. Administrator Statements of Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages to an Institution of Granting Librarians Faculty Status.

Column A Perceived Advantages	Column B Perceived Disadvantages
"The major advantages include attractiveness to prospective librarians. A closer feeling of belonging to the institution rather than second-class citizenship is another strength. It helps morale." Assistant Vice President	"Because of different basic responsibilities, librarians have difficulty in meeting common standards of teaching and scholarship." Vice President
"Library faculty members are more apt to be treated as professional peers by faculty members in other disciplines." Vice President	"Faculty and librarians work closely together and are supportive of each other; however, in the final analysis, the degree of freedom and independence afforded librarians is much less than for faculty. This in itself can create undue pressure and dissatisfaction." Vice Provost
"People who are respected and treated as peers act responsibly as full partners in the academic enterprise." Vice Chancellor	"The major disadvantage can be conflict in cases concerning promotion, tenure, and performance evaluation, if all levels of faculty and administration are not willing to accept different criteria. Institutions which insist upon uniform criteria for all faculty might find the system more trouble than it is worth." Vice Chancellor
"The major advantage of granting librarians faculty status is the statement that such a practice makes regarding the importance of librarians in the educational process." Assistant Vice President	"Only a very few of the academic librarians can meet faculty requirements for tenure." Associate Vice President
"Faculty status encourages professional attitude toward the position, the development of a research program, participation in university committees, professional interaction with other faculty members, etc." Assistant to the Vice Chancellor	"Promotion and tenure decisions are difficult because the criteria for librarians are different than for faculty generally." Provost
"Librarians (with faculty status) participate in all faculty curricular deliberations and thus understand the course and direction of university academic policy." Associate Vice Chancellor	"While librarians are judged (and perform) under similar high expectations, the criteria for advancement are different and thus it is inappropriate to place librarians under the same evaluation criteria.... They are not faculty." Assistant Provost
"Granting faculty status attracts a better qualified, more academically oriented professional to library service." Assistant Provost	"Overall, I believe that a significantly higher quality staff of professional librarians is possible if it is not necessary for every librarian to clear the tenure hurdle associated with faculty status." Vice President
"By integrating the librarians within the faculty, the overall perspective relating educational objectives is greatly strengthened and enhanced." Vice President	"Our librarians take pride in the distinction which exists between the typical professional work of the librarian and that of the faculty. There is a widely held belief, here, that to pretend that professional librarians are somehow thought to be faculty is to do their prestigious profession a disservice. The work and traditions are different." Vice Chancellor
"Encourages a higher degree of professionalism and status equal to faculty. Encourages original scholarship." Assistant Vice President	

Appendix B

Statements of administrators which briefly explain why the traditional facultycriteria were altered or given a different emphasis for library faculty.

"Librarians at our institution do not teach nor do they conduct research as it is conventionally viewed. Hence, criteria for tenure (since the faculty charter prescribes it for librarians) focus more on the quality of service performed and the importance of the position to the ongoing work of the library. Since librarians do not teach or conduct research, I questions the reasonableness of awarding them tenure."

Vice President

"No teaching required of librarians - requirements are different."

Assistant to the Vice Chancellor

"Less emphasis upon teaching and research - more upon professional expertise, service, and improvement of library resources."

Vice President

"Each college unit establishes its own criteria for promotion and tenure.... Traditional criteria of teaching, research to some extent, and public service have been altered."

Vice Chancellor

"Faculty criteria do not fit - which led to the conclusion that librarians should not be placed in a faculty category. Over the past couple of years, librarians up for promotion have been reviewed separate from faculty."

Assistant to the Vice President

"Less rigorous requirement for original scholarship and publication."

Vice President

"Teaching not a primary consideration; more emphasis upon university service and professional activity other than publication."

Associate Vice Chancellor

"Librarians have never been required to demonstrate scholarship or research. Clearly, teaching effectiveness has not been considered. These are central considerations in the case of other faculty. Few, if any, of our librarians could meet these criteria."

Executive Vice President

"Because librarians do little or no formal teaching and because few of them are significantly involved in the extension mission of the University, a separate criteria guide had to be developed."

Associate Provost

"Librarians, even at universities wherein they are a teaching faculty, simply are not trained well enough to even approach the level of research quality we expect and get from the basic disciplines, e.g. physics, psychology, American studies, and strong professions, e.g. pharmacy, clinical psychology, engineering. Their research topics are trivial."

Vice President

"The traditional faculty criteria were completely wiped out. The tenure requirement for our librarians is identical to that for public school teachers: three years of satisfactory service in the performance of daily duties."

Vice Chancellor

"Librarians are judged on criteria of service to library users, community service, technical knowledge and competence, whereas excellence in teaching, research, and service are tenure criteria for teaching faculty."

Assistant to the Provost

"Less emphasis on teaching in classrooms and seminars, more on one-to-one interaction, or teaching faculty as well as students; different types of research efforts."

Vice President

Thomas G. English
University of Minnesota

APPENDIX C: HALO-EFFECT

In the process of analyzing administrator statements of perceived advantages to an institution of granting librarians faculty status (Appendix A) the author found, inbedded in these statements, elements of a familiar hypothesis, to wit:that when librarians are shifted from nonfaculty to faculty status, they tend to become more responsible, more effective librarians. More than a decade ago, Muller, writing as a member of the ACRL Committee on Academic Status, expressed this theory as follows:

> "Another assumption that one might make is that having [faculty] status or an academic title should induce a librarian to measure up to the expectations implied in such a title... Even if the amount of scholarship produced by librarians may not be overly large or impressive, it will tend to make librarians more at home in the world of scholarship and thus cause them to become better librarians.[6]

However, this hypothesis is not supported by any known research, as Muller himself pointed out in the paper quoted above. Inadvertently, perhaps, such a theory implies that librarians at, say, Washington State, Illinois, or New York universities, who have faculty status, will naturally tend to outperform their nonfaculty counterparts at, say, Berkeley, Michigan, or Yale. Probably such an hypothesis would be difficult to either prove or disprove. But among academic librarians, this theory is likely, as not, to be discredited. Indeed, some of the chief sceptics of this hypothesis have been known to apply to it the label "halo-effect"* and to dismiss it as presumptious if not invalid.

---

*The author traced the expression halo-effect as far back as 1920, when psychologist Edward Thorndike wrote of the "power of the halo" to cause inflated psychological ratings.[7] Current definitions of this expression may be found in a number of dictionary sources in the behavioral sciences.[8]